A U M

A man, who has learnt little, grows old like an ox; his flesh grows, but his knowledge does not grow. —DHAMMAPADA.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XVII October, 1929 No. 12

THE PAGANISATION OF THEOSOPHY

VII

TOLSTOI says somewhere that religion is "man's relation to the universe," and one may perhaps be permitted to add that philosophy is man's theory about his relation to the universe.

On the basis of this definition there will be no limit to the number of philosophies, but only one religion. In practice, however, we shall find that the philosophies current among men can be grouped in three main divisions: Theist, Materialist, and Theosophical.

(1) the Theist philosophy is that naive view of the world which is held by the vast majority of mankind. It seeks to explain everything by the analogy of the human personality, which it believes instinctively to be the most fundamental kind of reality. There are many and various degrees of Theism, from the so-called "primitive animism", which sees in every tree and stone a tiny human-like personality, and in every phenomenon of nature the capricious action of a personal being, through polytheism, which postulates personal gods of the wind, the heavenly expanse, the sea, and so forth, up to the monotheism of the cultured Christian, Jew, and Moslem, who think that there is a vast personal deity, hidden behind the veil of the visible universe, of which he is the creator and ruler.

The characteristic of personal action is that it springs forth from will, exercised capriciously. We like one neighbor and dislike another; one day we are in the mood for one thing, the next day for something else. Our actions and thoughts conform for the most part to no definite plan or principle, but are based on the desires, whims, tastes, or fancies of the personal self. Just as the works of

man are the expression of his interior states which supply the motives that drive him to constant activity on the outer planes, so does Theist philosophy seek to explain the endless diversity of nature, and human life with all its marvelous potentialities, as being brought into existence by the will of a personal god in order to express his inner moods.

The ethics of Theism is, in a word, that we should do those things that are pleasing to, and commanded by god or the gods. Some of these precepts coincide with what may be termed the ethics of nature; others are merely formal and ritualistic, as for example, the prohibition to touch a thing that is "taboo," or the obligation to hear mass on Sundays. But, whether we obey, or disobey the divine commandments, the results have no relation or proportion to our acts: infinite rewards and punishments are imposed after death for finite deeds during life; and in this world the righteous are often afflicted like Job, because god either wills or allows it; and sinners prosper for no better reason. Some forms of Theism indeed deny that there is any connection whatsoever between conduct and salvation: did not Luther denounce good works as "filthy rags," and Calvin teach that salvation depended solely on predestination, that we were saved or damned because god had elected us to be so from the beginning of the world!

The Materialist philosophy regards the outer physical universe as the ultimate reality. The reflection of it in our conciousness, which is all we know of it, is by some unexplainable miracle an exactly true representation, although conciousness itself is conceived of as but a by-product of chemical and electrical phenomena in the matter of the brain. To that matter thought bears the same sort of relation as does the buzzing noise to the dynamo whose movement it accompanies. The universe is a huge mechanism, of which man and his world are minute and unimportant parts. Our actions are always and inevitably determined by our heredity and environment, just as the movements of each section of a machine are governed by the motion of the whole.

If materialists were consistent, their ethics would be merely historical and scientific—a description of the manner in which men act, and have acted in the past. The question of how men ought to act would be meaningless, seeing that they have no power to choose between alternative courses of action, and that the commonly held belief in such a power of choice is sheer delusion. In practice however, very few materialists are consistent: for the most part they are content to hold determinism as a theory and do not attempt to base their conduct upon it. They do not extend to the inner world of

thought and feeling and to the details of their own lives the rigid reign of law which they predicate of external nature; but as regards human conduct and its results for the actor, they appear, in actual practice, to believe in the regime of caprice with even fuller faith than do the Theists. The very notion that birth is the beginning, and death the final end of the human individual, at once destroys all possible concomitance between action and its consequences. If we are born into a character and environment that are not of our own making, and can at any moment evade by suicide all punishment for the most abominable crimes, or on the other hand by sure coming and unescapable death, lose the fruits of our most commendable labors, then life must be a thing without order, sequence or meaning.

The Theosophical philosophy alone can supply a firm and consistent basis for ethics, because in postulating the law of Karma with its pendant doctrine of reincarnation, it establishes an exact and inevitable relation between actions and their consequences. Each act of choice involves a reaction upon the chooser, not only through its effect upon his own character, but through the relations it creates with other individuals by means of whom the equivalent of his action will eventually be brought home to him. The inborn character, with which we come into life, is of our own making in lives gone by; and the environments in which we find ourselves, are those to which the affinities we created in the past have drawn us. Our present thoughts and deeds are modifying that character and those affinities for good or ill. We are thus making our future; and one day, sooner or later, we shall have to reap and garner the last sheaf of the harvest we are now engaged in sowing.

Theosophy insists that we can and should help each other, but the primary burden of effort and responsibility must ever be born by the individual for himself. The pilgrim, who is ascending the long and rugged Path, will be heartened and encouraged by the sympathy and comradeship of those who are travelling the same course; while, on the other hand, the indifference or opposition of those who are lingering by the wayside will tend to make his heart heavy and his footsteps lag. But, in either case, it is his own limbs that must do the climbing, and his own will power that must impel them; for it is a law of that road that no one may do more than help or hinder; no one may *compel* another either to progress or to halt. On that Path there are no short cuts to be achieved by favor, whether of gods in heaven or their self acclaimed representatives on earth.

All the great Messengers of the Lodge in the past have taught the law of Karma; and in the subsequent corruption and paganisa-

tion of their teachings, the desire to evade its decrees and to discover short cuts to spiritual or physical well being have played an important part. The great mass of mankind is always prone to believe in what seems to be pleasant and easy; men will rush to buy any patent medicine for either soul or body, provided it be skillfuly advertised. The very faith that prompts them to swallow the bolus will assure them that they feel better for so doing. It is largely for this reason that the great Theosophical Movements have tended to be unstable in their hold upon the ignorant majority. Once fossilized into a creed, a system may subsist unchanged for a thousand years: its stream flows gently downhill through a channel that is well worn and deep. Its priests have a strong vested interest in resisting change, and their flocks have all things made safe and easy for them so long as they do what they are told and refrain from the dangerous exercise of thinking. But in the Theosophical Movement, the course is up the mountain side, where every step in advance must be won by effort. Thousands, hearing the Message, are filled with pure enthusiasm, and essay the ascent. For a while they march bravely on; and then, the way being long, steep, dangerous, and withal tedious, they begin to grow tired. A few doggedly struggle on and on. Some look back regretfully at the valleys from which they began to climb—and after hesitating, perhaps, turn and retrace their steps. Others, and these are probably the most numerous, listen to the voices of those who offer to show them short and easy by-paths to the summit. Once started on these side tracks, there are but few with wit and discrimination to observe that they run not up hill, but down. The errant pilgrims are tired, and must at all costs have a way on which they can travel without effort: so long as this condition be fulfilled, they no longer worry about the direction in which they are going.

Sacramentalism and belief in Karma are mutually exclusive. Where the one waxes strong, the other declines and withers. The same is true of faith in personal gods, to which priestcraft is a corollary. Therefore it is that in our present-day Theosophical Movement we may regard those tendencies to evolve god cults, or demi-god cults; or to establish papacies, or leaderships by divine right; movements to assimilate with exoteric religions; revelations from "masters" which contradict, or modify what Masters have already set on record—all these things are undermining the belief in Karma and the whole Theosophical system of ethics which is based on it.

In reviewing the attitude of the various Theosophical societies

and their leaders on this subject, we shall not find that any of them have in so many words challenged the truth of the law of Karma. What we shall find, however, is that many of them have come to profess opinions which are utterly inconsistent with it. For example, if Karma be true, then there can be no such thing as the forgiveness of sins, and the formula of absolution, pronounced by the priests of the "Liberal Catholic Church" is but a jumble of meaningless and misleading words. If the "Theosophists," who pronounce them, or listen to them, believe in the rite they are celebrating, then it is quite inconceivable that they can also believe in Karma, with whatever unction they say the word when out of church. In this connection it should be remembered that a word may remain in verbal currency long after its true and original meaning has been corrupted or forgotten. Thus there are degenerate Buddhists who claim that, by twirling a praying wheel for hours on end, they are accumulating "good Karma." Perhaps our sacerdotally minded Theosophists persuade themselves that their sacraments and ceremonies are in like manner means of generating "good Karma." If so, then it is only a short step from their position to that of the Roman Catholic Church in which the faithful can earn liberal "indulgences" by gabbling prayers in Latin; for, between the praying wheel kind of "Karma" and the "indulgence," there is only the difference of a name.

If the motive behind the paganisation of Theosophy by Theosophists is their weariness over the task of achieving the complete conquest of their lower selves, and their longing for something easier to attempt, something that promises quick and more sensational results, the actual form taken by the paganising changes is usually a drift back to the beliefs and practices of the exoteric religions in which the members had been educated. Thus we have traced a reaction in India to orthodox Brahminism, and in the West to ecclesiastical Christianity.

This drift is a very insidious thing, and many of the good people who are being carried away by it, would deny the fact with the utmost vigor and indignation. One cannot, for example, scan the pages of the *Theosophical Quarterly* without admitting that those of its contributors, whose Christianising tendencies are most in evidence, are in all good faith convinced, not that they are themselves reacting to orthodoxy, but that their writings and example are doing much to Theosophise the churches. It is the old story over again of the tail that fancied it was wagging the dog; but the dog knew better, and so did the onlookers. As an instance from the *Quarterly* of views which are utterly inconsistent with Karma, the

following words from one of Mr. C. A. Griscom's letters are apposite:

> ". . . You cannot hope to make progress in spiritual matters with unconfessed sins on your conscience. You cannot hope to have a real conviction of sin, to realise your own shortcomings, unless you confess to the person you have injured. That, and that alone, will bring home to you the hideousness of what you have done; that, and that alone, will ease your mind and heart and conscience; that, and that alone will indicate true repentance and contrition." (*Theos. Quarterly,* July, 1926, pp. 48-9).

It will be instructive to compare Mr. Griscom's Exhortation with the advice given by Mr. Judge:

> "The Past! What is it? Nothing. Gone! Dismiss it. You are the past of yourself. Therefore it concerns you not as such. It only concerns you as you now are. In you, as you now exist, lies *all* the past. So follow the Hindu maxim: 'Regret nothing, never be sorry; and cut all doubts with the sword of spiritual knowledge.' Regret is productive only of error. I care not what I *was,* or what anyone *was.* I only look for what I am each moment. For as each moment is and at once is not, is must follow that if we think of the past we forget the present, and while we forget, the moments fly by us, making more past. Then regret nothing, not even the greatest follies of your life, for they are gone, and you are to work in the present which is both past and future at once." (*Letters That Have Helped Me,* V.I., ch. VIII).

Mr. Judge and Mr. Griscom were both writing to people who were worried by the memory of things they had done in the past; but the advice given is utterly contradictory. Mr. Judge expounds the Theosophical viewpoint, and Mr. Griscom that of the average Anglican (Episcopalian) clergyman. Can it be questioned that his conception of Karma, at the time he wrote the words quoted, had become modified into something quite unlike what he had learned years before from the writings of H. P. B., and from Mr. Judge, whose personal pupil he had been? Thus, from the *Key*:

> "Every such attempt as the Theosophical Society has hitherto ended in failure, because, sooner or later, it has degenerated into a sect, set up hard and fast dogmas of its own, and so lost by imperceptible degrees that vitality which living truth alone can impart. You must remember that all our members have been bred and born in some creed or religion, that all are more or less of their generation both physically and mentally, and consequently that their judgment is but too likely to be warped and unconciously biassed by some or all of these influences. If then, they cannot be freed from such inherent bias, or at least taught to recognise it instantly and so avoid

> being led away by it, the result can only be that the Society will drift off onto some sandbank of thought or another, and there remain a stranded carcass to moulder and die."

The hope for the future of the Theosophical Movement until the next Messenger comes in 1975, must necessarily lie in a loyal and intelligent devotion to the study and application of the Message of 1875—the Theosophy of H. P. B. and W. O. Judge.

From a Student's Note-Book

So many enquirers want a "course of study" mapped out for them! While general direction may wisely be given, experience has shown that a "cut and dried" study-plan that will fit all and sundry cannot be provided—not in Theosophy, that science which synthesizes every department of ever-active, ever-changing life. True it is that all human beings are alike; but true also is it that all are some different. Each represents his own combination of qualities, together with the personal mind that emerges from his use of qualities—no two points of view quite the same. Again, to tell an enquirer just what to do is to become his "teacher," though unwittingly. The fact is, we are all *students*—and not such remarkably capable students for the most part. The wise and effective plan, then, appears to be along the lines of general suggestion, to encourage enquirers and enable them to find their own way. Even the Masters do not try to make up people's minds for them. They know that the human mind is not so constituted; it has to see and know for itself.

"THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEOSOPHY AND—"

VERY often, inquiries are made as to the "difference" between Theosophy and various other teachings. Not infrequently these inquiries come buttressed with arguments to the effect that there is truth in other teachings, and that of course Theosophy could not reasonably claim it all—"No one has the monopoly on truth, you know!" Such statements may even be augmented by evidence in the way of detailed descriptions of saintly characters presently enrolled in churches, the pointing out of obvious facts in certain philosophies, the relating of healing accomplished by cultists, and eulogies of "wonderful" men and women who are putting forth attractive "new" ideas and who are declared to be most intelligent, honest, sincere and devoted.

Gainsaying none of the evidence thus presented, but going back to the original question about the difference between Theosophy and other teachings, there is but one answer to make: Theosophy differs from anything only as Truth differs from falsehood. Theosophy is not a system of claims, nor a formulation of guessing men. It is a body of Knowledge, garnered through age-long observation, scientifically conducted, on the part of Super Men—Beings whose sight pierces below the surface facts and phenomena of life, and who see with Soul-vision, looking "directly on ideas." They whose knowledge Theosophy represents see both from within outward, and from without clear in to the spiritual reality that resides at the heart of all things. They know through self-effort, and so can all men know by pursuing the same method, for Theosophy is Their gift to Their younger brothers. It both presents the Doctrine and reveals the way and means by which each may become the Knower of it. An open mind is called for.

Now, since all things, from least to greatest, are the result of action; and since "every action without exception is comprehended in spiritual knowledge," Truth can exclude nothing. So Theosophy, being knowledge of Life in all departments, includes everything, explains everything—even falsehood. It differs from nothing that is true, because it is the truth about all things, visible and invisible.

Again, Truth is changeless and cannot be contaminated. Granting then that there is truth in Christian Science, Spiritualism, New Thought, Rosicrucianism, and all the many cults and "isms", why

should Theosophists veer away from any of them? Why not be "broad" and "tolerant" by including them all, subscribing to them all, supporting them all, recommending them to enquirers? The student of Theosophy does not "combine" it with any other teaching for the same reason that he would refrain from drinking from a sewer or a poisoned fountain. Water itself can not be contaminated; neither can Truth. But just as water can be used as a solvent and carrier of filth and poisonous substances; so can the pure Teaching, by being deflected into corrupt and poisonous channels become commingled with utter misconceptions. But no matter with what water may be commingled, it will eventually return to the Ocean-mother's bosom pure and clear. And so it is with truth: it shall rise triumphant above the falsehoods spoken in its name. Then why the anomaly of these falsehoods?

Perhaps a quick survey of the genealogy of spurious teachings may help us to understand a little better, these strange perversions: not a teaching but that, traced to its source, will be found to have originated, either directly or indirectly, in the Ancient and Eternal Wisdom Religion. What is the trouble then? How is it that the children of immaculate parentage have become corrupt? How came this straying from the Royal Lineage—the path of the Eternal Verities? Through *small* beginnings and *slight* divergencies, the which, long continued, resulted in large increment and great angles of inclination. The article "a" is such a *little* letter; but what a vast gulf lies between *a* religion and religion, *a* philosophy and philosophy, *a* science and science! Now this is how it came about—the only way that such a thing could come about. The direct progenitor of the article "a", in this connection, is an ancient derelict named "my". The parent Truth includes all, enlightens all, teaches love and service of all. But some of the children of Truth, after following the precepts, and having attained some degree of knowledge, and proficiency in its application, began to see a *difference* between themselves and their brothers and sisters not yet so far developed. The Mother had helped them much, thinking to have their able assistance in nourishing and strengthening her feebler children. But these stronger ones became weary of assisting the rest, with no reward to themselves; and dwelling on this idea, became enamored and enmeshed in their cogitation, and finally left the family of "ALL," and changed their name to "My", yet still claiming their inheritance of Truth. This "My" off-shoot from the original "All" family became very prolific, bringing forth many, diverse, and contentious progeny, now known under the name of "a". All of this numerous brood are haughty

graduates from the University of Personal Desire. The diplomas from the innumerable departments of this University are all inscribed, "This is the Way!" And the slogan of every graduate is, "Follow *me*."

Under the tutelage of such as these come many, in their quest of the Soul, only to meet with disillusionment and fall into scepticism. Too often, such suffering seekers are long in awakening to the fact that a counterfeit bespeaks the Real, somewhere. Others more wary —perhaps more intelligent, or possibly less guileless and devoted— than those who have been trapped, stand apart and, impartially looking, perceive "some truth" in all teachings. If this perception is due to intelligent, calm judgment, backed by real Soul-hunger, it will inevitably be discovered that on the opposite side of the shield engraved "some truth", there will be found "much falsehood." This carefully pondered will reveal the implied fact of *dire danger*, and the possibility of *woe unspeakable*.

Never yet has error been found to agree with error; hence the "Lo, here; and Lo, there!" But Truth always agrees with Truth. Theosophy is not a collectivity, but a Unity; it is not made up of the truths in other systems; but all the truth in other systems emanated from Theosophy. They are but sparks stolen from the Hearth-Fire of the Mother doctrine, and used to feed the consuming flames of self-seeking, in many places. To the self-gratulatory, Theosophy in its purity and wholeness may not "smile." For it holds no special privileges and bestows no personal honors. It reveals no royal road for the select few; but it offers to all the "precious boon of learning truth, the right perception of existing things, the knowledge of the non-existent." It honors the Self of all and points out the "Kingly Knowledge and the Kingly Mystery" to each who humbly seeks.

"Difference" is not a suitable word to use in regard to Theosophy. Differences do not pertain to it; they all lie in the other teachings, and would be better denominated "divergencies." Theosophy marks out the natural lines of evolution. To diverge from these, is to depart from the inherent Plan of Nature. The Goal can not be reached through by-paths and side-lines. These, one and all, lead nowhere and end in bottomless quagmires. Very different is the fate of any beguiled into them, from the glorious destiny of those who follow in the foot-steps of the Predecessors, striving earnestly "to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others." Vast, indeed, is the difference between slavery and freedom!

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

XVI

Living through a vaster sweep of time, the atom of science has as much its own rigid law of birth, growth, and death as any animal or human body. This once despised teaching of Theosophy has become a scientific speculation, and now is on the way, following Millikan and others, to crystallize into dogma. There is also dawning an understanding that the energy which gives birth to matter literally *reincarnates* as other matter after a cycle of unknown ages. *Energy* is the reincarnating principle of the forms of matter; the Divine Ego—a whirlwind of Cosmic energy of a category unguessed by science—is the reincarnating principle of man; Prana or Jiva, the vital essence which underlies the activity of all living beings, the reincarnating principle of the animal. But it is true also that stars reincarnate; and incredible as it may seem, science has now laid hold upon the outer and visible changes which proceed from the hidden transformations.

Dr. Paul R. Heyl, of the U. S. Bureau of Standards, has collected the figures upon "exploding stars," and has found that there is one such cosmic cataclysm about every three weeks.[1] Prof. Russell concludes that every star in the heavens must suffer this fate at least once in a lifetime! Then, asks Dr. Heyl, why has our sun escaped this? Or has it suffered that fate, or is it to suffer it in the future?

Meantime, the star Nova Pictoris, which recently "exploded," has subsequently reversed the evolutionary order of procedure and is changing into a nebula. H. P. Blavatsky, contending against the now defunct Laplace Nebular Hypothesis, remarked upon a parallel case as follows:

> Since the discovery of the spectroscope, its magic power has revealed to its adepts only one single transformation of a star of this kind; and even that one showed directly the reverse of what is needed as proof in favour of the nebular theory; namely—*a star transforming itself into a planetary nebula.* As told in *The Observatory (Vol. I., P. 185),* the temporary star which appeared in the constellation Cygnus, in November, 1876, . . . exhibited a spectrum broken by very brilliant lines. Gradually, the continuous spectrum and most of the lines disappeared, leaving finally one single brilliant line, which appeared to coincide with the green line of the nebula. (*S. D.* I, 596).

There have been many "novae" observed; in most cases there has

---

[1] *Scientific Monthly,* June, 1928.

been a great flare of light from the "explosion," followed by a reconsolidation and diminution of the light. The cases where stars blaze out and then progressively return to the nebulous state are few. Let us then attempt to solve this by applying the analogy of the human cycle. The human Ego is ancient; more so by far than any of the heavenly bodies which house him temporally. He lives in and through a vast circling of wheels within wheels; through the individual human cycle of incarnation of a few centuries duration; undergoes a vaster change of scene through the cycle of a race, which sees new continents, civilizations, and sciences rise, decay, and sink forgotten; many of these make a minor manvantara before the planetary pralaya wherein all life ceases for a frozen aeon. When these days and nights of the planet have run their course, the Ego finds himself amid new scenes upon another planet vivified by the life-force of the old; a force of which he himself forms the leading and *conscious* principle.

But a sun also is in evolution; many as are the planetary lives embraced in its "day," that day also must give place to a destruction and recreation for other things. Hence, the sun-forces enduring through eternities at last reach their balance with waning cohesive powers inherited from the original material impulse—and a "solar pralaya," or star-explosion, said in a Master's letter of the early '80's to "take place in the twinkling of an eye," bursts forth, filling the telescope of the astronomer with the wonders of a new "nova" and his mind with weird speculations. It is taught that the appearance is due to the release of the seven solar principles, normally interwoven and interworking behind the veils of matter; principles whose unveiled intensity destroys and blasts everything in the system of which that star was Lord. It is the analogy of the death of the man, which releases his vital powers to rejoin the great ocean of formless life, his pattern-shape and his passions to coalesce into the spiritualistic spook, and his *Atma-Buddhi-Manas* to remain latent and unseen in the subjective world, the future center of a new personality, while his ashes become one with the dust of the earth. The visible self is scattered over all Nature, leaving the reality stripped, but whole and unharmed. Thus the dying star, having destroyed its surroundings in its final agony, sinks slowly into the invisible, until a new reincarnation for itself and its satellites shall fall due.

But there is a last incarnation for every man: after Devachans and Nirvanas without number comes Paranirvana. These suns which explode and thenceforth expand, becoming more ethereal as they encompass the heavens on their way back to primordial matter—

is their course run, their substance to vanish until the dawn of a new "Life of Brahma?" Are their living principles to rest in the Great Unknown through countless eternities while other systems evolve and die? We do not know; it seems probable.

One of the most obscure and intriguing hints in all Theosophy is given in the *Voice of the Silence,* p. 37. Is it true, then, that the life of a planet holds its course parallel to that of a man unto the very end? That even as the lowliest man, if successful in the race, has before him the future of a Planetary Spirit at some distant time, so the planet shall become sun and super-sun? It seems so; thus says the *Secret Doctrine:*

> The assertion that all the worlds (Stars, planets, etc.)—as soon as a nucleus of primordial substance in the *laya* (undifferentiated) state is informed by the freed principles, of a just *deceased* sidereal body — become first comets, and then Suns to cool down to inhabitable worlds, is a teaching as old as the Rishis . . . It is only after losing its velocity, and hence its fiery tail, that the "Fiery Dragon" settles down into quiet and steady life as a regular respectable citizen of the sidereal family . . . what is there so impossible that a laya centre—a lump of cosmic protoplasm, homogeneous and latent, when suddenly animated or fired up—should rush from its bed in Space and whirl throughout the abysmal depths in order to strengthen its homogeneous organism by an accumulation and addition of differentiated elements? And why should not such a comet settle in life, live, and become an inhabited globe! (I, 203-4).

Says the *Secret Doctrine* also, part of that "settling" is passage through a sun-stage, to be followed by contraction and cooling.

A new mineral called Labradorite, from the place of its occurrence, has been collected by Dr. James H. C. Martens, of Cornell University, along the coast of Labrador, Newfoundland, and Greenland.[2] Dr. Martens thinks it formed the "core of the earth" 550,000,000 years ago: *and it flashes every color of the spectrum.*

Have we not here in very fact, that same "accumulation and addition of differentiated elements" so necessary to the *full* expression of life upon the globe? Deeper students of Theosophy will comprehend the intimate relation between life and color.

Since the substance of a planet in its full development is organized, informed, and ruled by, the consciousness of the highest beings on it —whether they know it or not—then the evolution of the planet must follow the evolution of its mankind—for good or evil. Its outward form and its sidereal position must in some way reflect the inner state of its men. *The Ocean of Theosophy* states that Venus

[2] *Washington Star,* January 26, 1927.

is incalculably higher in evolution than are we; and that some of its comparatively great light is due to that fact. How far is that correspondence carried in the whole evolution of a planetary body?

> *The Seven Beings in the Sun are the Seven Holy Ones, Self-born from the inherent power in the matrix of Mother substance. It is they who send the Seven Principal Forces, called rays, which at the beginning of Pralaya will centre into seven new Suns for the next Manvantara. The energy from which they spring into concious existence in every Sun, is what some people call Vishnu, which is the breath of the* ABSOLUTENESS. (From the ancient Commentary) (*Secret Doctrine, I,* 290).

Shall we assume that these "holy ones" are the immaculate creation of some deity? Or shall we say that they are where they are, and what they are, under Karmic law; by their own efforts through cycles from the lowest to the highest, like everything else manifest? Shall not Earth some time be a Venus—perchance in the Seventh Race—and shall not Venus become in its turn the life-giver of a family of planets? Shall not our sun—as yet a speck in Cosmos—some time attain to the gigantic power of a Betelguese? Who knows?

Those "Seven holy ones," and the seven principles which burst forth at Solar Pralaya, released to form new suns—is it that sidereal development follows the human, that those who attain wisdom go forth in their turn, to create within their capacity new centers of life, of spiritual knowledge and understanding? Will the Principles of our planet, spiritualized and raised to an unimaginable plane, some day be worthy of mergence with one of the new centers created by an "exploding" sun, to form the lower aspect of a new and glorious entity, even as the Lunar Pitris were taken unto and into the Manasaputra?

Those sixteen stellar systems found by Dr. Henroteau,[8] thought to be single stars yet proven to be three or four—can we not surmise that these bodies are either planets which have evolved to a state indistinguishable from suns, or that they are new evolutions accreted about new solar centers emanating from dead suns?

Once allowed that *all is life;* once allowed—as science does allow—that life, wherever it is, strives to create organic forms and to carry them ever forward to greater heights, greater complexity, greater intelligence: and what lets from perceiving that all forms whatever must follow the universal "biological" laws of birth, growth, death, re-creation, and constantly increasing intelligence,

[8] *The Week's Science,* April 9, 1928.

whether they are atoms, men or sun? That in the supernal worlds as well as in the sea-bottom mud, the lesser form seeks self-realization by consolidation within, and absorption into, the higher form? That as the units of the planetary centers of life group themselves into organisms, and perchance in the end of ends throw themselves into the altars of blazing suns, they find, as men find who dare the utmost, beyond the sacrifice of personal and form-bound life, lie the infinitudes of life form-*less,* impersonal and eternal?

H. P. B. On The Sun

The Sun, as on our plane, is not even "Solar" fire. The Sun we see, gives nothing of itself, because it is a reflection; a bundle of electro-magnetic forces, one of the countless milliards of "Knots of Fohat." Fohat is called the "Thread of primeval Light," the "Ball of thread" of Ariadne, indeed, in this labyrinth of chaotic matter. This thread runs through the seven planes tying itself into knots. Every plane being septenary, there are thus forty-nine mystical and physical forces, larger knots forming stars, suns and systems, the smaller planets, and so on. . . The electro-magnetic knot of our Sun is neither tangible nor dimensional, nor even as molecular as the electricity we know. The Sun absorbs, "psychisizes" and vampirizes its subjects within its system. Further than this it gives out nothing of itself. It is an absurdity, therefore, to say that the solar fires are being consumed and gradually extinguished. The Sun has but one distinct function; it gives the impulse of life to all that breathes and lives under its light. The sun is the throbbing heart of the system; each throb being an impulse. But this heart is invisible: no astronomer will ever see it. That which is concealed in this heart and that which we feel and see, its apparent flame and fires, to use a simile, are the nerves governing the muscles of the solar system, and nerves, moreover, outside of the body. This impulse is not mechanical but a purely spiritual, nervous impulse. - - *Transactions,* 116-7.

THEOSOPHICAL TEMPERANCE*

WESTERN theosophists need patience, determination, discrimination, and memory, if they ever intend to seize and hold the attention of the world for the doctrines they disseminate. A few score of earnest, active, generous Brethren can thus in time sow seed over this whole continent, and prepare the harvest which is sure to come, but which will come the sooner if we fail not in our labor.

At the present time one of the most urgent needs is for a simplification of Theosophical teachings. Theosophy is simple enough; it is the fault of its exponents if it is made complicated, abstruse or vague. Yet enquiring people are always complaining that it is too difficult a subject for them, and that their education has not been deep enough to enable them to understand it. This is greatly the fault of the members who have put it in such a manner that the people sadly turn away. At public meetings or when trying to interest an enquirer it is absolutely useless to use Sanskrit, Greek or other foreign words. Nine times out of ten the habit of doing so is due to laziness or conceit. Sometimes it is due to having merely learned certain terms without knowing and assimilating the ideas underneath. The ideas of Theosophy should be mastered, and once that is done it will be easy to express those in the simplest possible terms. And discussions about the Absolute, the Hierarchies, and so forth, are worse than useless. Such ideas as Karma, Reincarnation, the Perfectibility of Man, the Dual Nature, are the subjects to put forward. These can be expounded—if you have grasped the ideas and made them part of your thought—from a thousand different points of view. At all meetings the strongest effort should be made to simplify by using the words of our own language in expressing that which we believe.

Every earnest student of theosophy proper, ought by this time to have learned that little is gained to the cause of truth by either argument or invective, and that nothing is gained by denunciation.

Don't speak or write as if morality and ethics were unknown before H. P. B. wrote the *Voice of the Silence*. Buddhism, Christianity, and all the other religions teach the same morals, and literature is full of it.

Don't teach that vegetarianism is the road to heaven and spiritual

---

* Excerpted from the writings of Wm. Q. Judge.

growth. Has not our old friend H. P. B. written suggestively that cows and elephants are pure vegetarians? Reflect on the fact that some of the very best people on earth were meat-eaters, and that wicked or gross thoughts are more hurtful than the eating of a ton of flesh.

Don't think or say that phenomena are good stepping stones to Theosophy. They are not, for those who stand upon them will fall from them to their hurt.

Don't say that science is all wrong and that men of science are materialists. Huxley has done us good service; and Spencer has many a good thing in his works. Besides, if you want H. P. B. on the matter, you can read her words that the truth is to be found in a union of science with occultism.

Don't think or say that the only true occultism is found in the East, or that we must go to the East for it, or that the West has none of it. Remember that the energy of the lodge of Masters was first expended here in the West in this age. Perhaps it is as has been hinted many a time, that the true thing is to be found in a union of the East and the West.

To explain, to illustrate, and to unfold a principle of philosophy, or a law of nature, is, however, quite another matter. It is enough for us to place truth in its best light by both precept and example, and thus all who are really in search of the truth will recognize it by kinship with the truth in themselves. Error will thus fall away from truth as the veil from the chiseled marble. Who will look at the veil when once the statute is revealed? People are then looking up and not down. It is, therefore, of very great importance to keep the lines of work and of interpretation clear and untangled. This is much better than the glorification of any Brotherhood, and the Lodge is always aiming at such results, for selfish pride, arrogance, and the love of personal dominion have no place therein.

DEATH AND IMMORTALITY

At first sight Death and Immortality seem to be a contradiction in terms. Weighing the one against the other, as is the human method of thinking, faith and fact seem to come squarely in conflict. All men know death to be the final act in the drama of mortal existence, while immortality presents itself to us only in the guise of belief or doubt. Our science, which has discovered so much in regard to physical existence, has unearthed nothing at all in respect of purely metaphysical life. Our religion, the same as all others, offers nothing but the hope, the dictum, the dogma, that death, which we know to upset the whole order of physical nature, may also upset the whole order of metaphysical nature. Since two of the mainsprings of conduct are faith and knowledge it follows that, if they cannot be reconciled, each man becomes a house divided against itself. Probably the majority of men to-day, as always, try to solve this vast problem by stultifying their reason in order to retain their faith. Others, an increasing minority of thoughtful men in our times, accepting the fact of death, accept also the idea that it means extinction, and hence do their utmost to keep from thinking of the subject at all. This is the real conflict between religion and science. Always it has existed, and always it will continue to confront mankind individually as collectively, until the problem is *solved,* not merely evaded or postponed.

If our religious beliefs were fundamentally true, then every advance in scientific knowledge should increasingly confirm our faith. All know the contrary to be the case. The immense augmentation in knowledge of physical nature has but served to contribute many elements tending to unsettle religious convictions hitherto regarded as impregnable, so that the intelligent portion of mankind grows more and more materialistic, more and more inclined to the golden rule of paganism: Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die.

If our basic scientific theories, and the implications logically inherent in them, were fundamentally sound, then surely we should find men becoming more responsible with increasing power, and we should have an increased insight into the purpose of life. All of us would become more purposeful, more responsible, more hopeful and more happy. As it is, increasing knowledge brings increasing pessimism, so that it is as sadly true to-day as when Pope wrote his commentary on the vanity and inanity of our science:

"Where ignorance is bliss,
'tis folly to be wise."

There are many thinkers who see clearly the inevitable outcome of this conflict between religion and science, between faith and fact, and would, if they could, heal the breach. Many ideas, good in themselves, are propounded, but they all lack vitality and inspiring power, because they do not face the real issue. They all in the end deplore the loss of faith, but have not the knowledge to raise it from the dead. How is religion to be resurrected by science, how is faith to be regained by means of the knowledge which has destroyed it? Or shall we attempt to destroy our hard-earned science by means of a dead and dying faith? The one remedy is as fatuous and impossible as the other. All this beating over old ground is but running in circles, for these well-meaning but ignorant physicians are themselves no less deeply infected than their patients with the prevailing disease of the age in which we live. Neither in our science nor in our religion is to be found the real cure, because the diagnoses of both are erroneous. Is there any other explanation of life and death, of nature and man, than that which underlies alike our religious revelations and our scientific theories—an explanation that neither denies nor palliates any fact, and that indissolubly unites faith, hope, and love in the holy bond of knowledge which transcends the grave?

Such a knowledge must satisfy the moral instinct of mankind without doing violence to reason—must indeed employ reason to educate that moral instinct; must give the greatest minds their fullest scope, yet must not overwhelm the understanding of a child. The children as well as men, the ignorant as well as the most wise, the depraved equally with the virtuous, must face the fact of death, should face death, as they should face life, with open and intelligent eyes. Yet as matters stand with all men, it is in death alone they find a common brotherhood, the brotherhood of ignorance, where there should be the brotherhood of universal knowledge.

Theosophists living in the world, sharing in all respects the common lot, are the ones to whom the Masters of Wisdom must look to restore to mankind a religion which shall be scientific, a science which shall be religious. And why? Because Theosophists are in daily and hourly contact and communication with their less favored Brethren, and thus enabled to treat with them in a common language on the meaning of their common experiences—something which the Masters of Wisdom cannot do except at rare conjunctions indeed.

The Masters can and do preserve the Secret Doctrine of Life,

which includes both death and immortality, even when it has been lost to mankind, as now; can cause its re-presentation under given conditions, as has been done in the Theosophy of H. P. Blavatsky. But when once more restored to the world by some Messenger of the Great Lodge of Masters, what then? Thereafter, the preservation and dissemination of the Message must rest, under Law, upon all those, the least as the greatest, who have by reason of their Karma in past lives been drawn within the sphere of influence of the Messenger and the Message. It is high time for all sincere Theosophists to recognize and take to heart their universal duty—to throw their energies into the study, application, and promulgation of the Eternal Verities. If we cannot have unity, study, and work on subjects of universal interest and importance, how vain to talk Universal Brotherhood along personal and controversial lines.

Are death and immortality incompatible? This is the question of the ages, fruitlessly asked of religion and science by every Ego born into earthly conditions. The fact of death weighs heavily on the consciousness of all mankind. Theosophists hold the solution of the riddle of mortal existence, and stand charged with the surpassing responsibility of keeping the great Truths of their philosophy ever in the foreground of their own consciousness—of fitting themselves to be the better able to present those truths in forms assimilable to the understanding of their less endowed fellows. It is not enough oneself to have recognized these great truths in the formulations adopted by the Masters of Wisdom. Like the symbols of modern science or the equations of great mathematicians, the writings of H. P. Blavatsky are in large part intended for *students* of the Wisdom-Religion, and hence are either incomprehensible or misunderstood by those who are mentally and morally deficient, or who are warped by the very conflict between religion and science. Yet both the multitude and the leaders of the multitude must be reached by Theosophists, if the great doctrines of the One SELF, of Karma and Reincarnation, of Spiritual and Intellectual as well as merely Physical evolution, are to take root in the mind of the race, and thus gradually bring about a new era in the affairs of mankind.

Theosophists have to take to heart the method and the modulus of Masters and H. P. B., as well as their doctrines, if our duty is to be done by others as has been done by the great Teachers toward us. That method is to deal with the mind of the race as we find it exhibited in ourselves and by our fellows in our mutual daily intercourse and questioning. That modulus is to avail ourselves of our

common knowledge and our common experiences as a common capital which can be more widely extended, more wisely employed, in the attempt to solve the great problems which all human experience and all human knowledge continually present to us but do not explain. In both method and modulus as they should be employed by Theosophists, it is certain that W. Q. Judge has set an example of fidelity and effectiveness unapproached by any of the disciples of H. P. Blavatsky. In a sense whose vital importance has not yet been fully realized by students, Mr. Judge was ceaselessly engaged in bridging the gulf between Masters and men, between the Message and human understanding and application of it.

Each sincere Theosophist is in himself a possible bridge, a connecting link, between Theosophy and those men and women with whom his Karma brings him into constant relations. Among those men and women are many whose religious convictions are unsettled or destroyed, who yet *feel,* if they do not know, that there must be some adequate moral principle in the midst of the apparent immorality of birth and death, some "force that makes for righteousness" in the midst of the apparently unanswerable questions of good and evil. Still others there are in growing numbers who have not found in the materialism of the day anything but iconoclasm, and who know that our science is just as ignorant as themselves on the nature of all those problems which constitute the true "struggle for existence" in the mind of the human being.

These two classes of our fellow men require different treatment, different help, but all of them are alike interested in the great problem of death and immortality, all of them ready to listen to what Theosophy has to say on the subject, if only its teachings be wisely presented within the limits of their nature. Surely all Theosophists can take to heart, and begin to apply for themselves, what H. P. B. herself has made so pointedly plain in the *Introductory* and the *Proem* of her "Secret Doctrine:"

> "Every reader will inevitably judge the statements made from the stand-point of his own knowledge, experience, and consciousness, based on what he has already learnt. . . .
>
> "It is absolutely necessary that the reader should be made acquainted with the few fundamental conceptions which underlie and pervade the entire system of thought to which his attention is invited. These basic ideas are few in number, and on their clear apprehension depends the understanding of all that follows . . . they are, in fact, contained—though too often under a misleading guise—in every system of thought or philosophy worthy of the name.

> "Once that the reader has gained a clear comprehension of them and realised the light which they throw on every problem of life, they will need no further justification in his eyes, because their truth will be to him as evident as the sun in heaven."

Theosophy itself is to be presented in its fundamental principles, as the key to the rational explanation of Life. The nature and meaning of Life in its everlasting process of Becoming can be simply as well as profoundly presented, and then birth, death, and rebirth can be seen for what they are—the means of Soul-evolution, or Individual immortality. In essaying and in adhering to this program of effort the humblest Theosophist becomes a co-worker with Nature, a Companion of the Masters of Wisdom, more and more conscious of the Real Presence even while engaged in the ordinary duties of every day life.

FROM A STUDENT'S NOTE-BOOK

"Invisible worlds" must be "within" the visible: hence they will never be found outside himself by the seeker. What are the "principles" of Man but each one's contact with the hidden side of Nature? Each is a path to some recondite phase of life and intelligence, actually subservient to the traveler thereon, though too often he permits himself to become subservient to it. All are well-trodden highways, familiarly used by every human daily and hourly without his being aware of the fact. Why seek mysteries, then, through some proclaimed "teacher," when each is plunged while awake or asleep in the very midst of the mysteries? The orientation of oneself is all that is needed—to "find" oneself. To learn by observation in what "principle" one is thinking and acting at any and every moment, is the key to the mysteries; for after a while the persistent and watchful observer will discover that he is able to turn it.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS

Once more the elder brothers have indicated where the truth—Theosophy—could be found, and the companions all over the world are engaged in bringing it forth for wider currency and propagation.

"MOTHER!" Mary Jane sank into a chair with a weary sigh and flung her books carelessly on the floor. "People *ir*ritate me so!"

Mother looked thoughtfully at the young lady, mentally calculating whether Mary Jane needed sleep or food, but outwardly she only smiled and inquired, "Why, dear?"

"I don't know just why," explained Mary Jane, "but they do. I like many people but they annoy me in little ways. For instance—Miss Cook the algebra teacher at school—she is so nice, mother. She seems to get our point of view exactly, and explains the problems so clearly. She is great fun at school parties, but the way she puts on make-up simply *ruins* her. She has a bright red spot high on each cheek, and a messy looking red smear on her lips. It looks terrible."

"And Emily, Mother—you *know* I like her—but she has such awful table manners."

"Are your table manners always above reproach, Mary Jane?"

"No-o. I do gobble sometimes, but I don't make noises when I eat, and you make me sit up straight at the table. Emily doesn't, and you know, Mother, I can't say anything to her."

At this point Philip ranged into the room and deposited his books. Mother acknowledged his presence with "Hello, son," but Mary Jane was too engrossed in her woes.

"I like old Mr. Tebb," she continued, "but it makes me fidgety to see his poor old hands tremble. It seems so awful to get old and shaky. It irritates me because it takes Grandma so long to find a passage in a book. I know she can't see well, but it bothers me just the same."

Mary Jane slumped lower into the chair. Philip, who had been lending an interested ear to the conversation, looked puzzled.

"Mary Jane is telling me how irritated she becomes over little personal mannerisms of people whom she really likes," explained Mother. "They seem to be mostly exterior physical mannerisms such as bad table manners and excessive use of make-up."

"Oh," said Phil with vast understanding, "if *that's* your topic, I could a tale unfold—but I will spare you the painful details. How-

ever, I sympathize, Mary Jane, and *how!* But say, Mom, isn't that strange, we were talking about that very thing today at school.

"Professsor Adams was lecturing on the so-called 'realists' in the English literature course. He was talking about Zola and Sinclair Lewis. 'In his novels,' said Professor Adams, 'Lewis described the flies on drug store counters in middle Western towns, and said he was giving reality. Zola filled his novels with terrible incidents taken from actual life. He put the experiences of several men's lives into one story, but if anyone protested the truthfulness of an incident, Zola drew out his files where he kept the newspaper clippings and showed the non-believer the proof.

" 'Well,' the Professor went on to say. 'those things are true, but are they reality?' You know, Mom, the old boy dearly loves to give us his philosophy of life, and it is not such a bad one at that. 'What *is* reality?' he asked us. 'Is it the selfishness of man, the physical decay of senescence, the flies on the counter? Those are real, yes, but other things are real, too—the beauty of nature, man's love for his brother—Why not,' said he, 'consider the better dreams of men, their countless little unremembered acts of kindness?'

"And you know, Mom," continued Phil, "If that man was not describing the pairs of opposites, and if by telling us to concentrate on the better dreams of men he wasn't advising us to remember the Higher Self of one is the Higher Self of all, what was he doing? I dashed up after class and told him that I thought his idea was great. He looked at me with a dry little smile, and asked, 'It is true, isn't it?' "

"You just bet it is true! So—Mary Jane," advised Phil with brotherly condescension, "if you will just overlook the petty annoyances, and remember the better dreams of men and the Higher Self-"

"That is all very well," burst forth Mary Jane, "for Theosophists and people who know we *have* a Higher Nature, but, how about people who judge by the exterior only. There are lots of them, and they will keep right on being annoyed. They won't be able to overlook Emily's bad table manners. They will judge appearances and not stop to find out how really nice she is underneath.

"Why do we bathe, and care for our hair and nails, and wear clean clothes? You can't concentrate on the Higher Self if the lower needs attention, now, *can* you, Mother?"

"No," said Mother, "you can't. We say that our bodies are only vehicles, but every vehicle needs attention. You know how unpleasant a slovenly appearance or bad table manners are. We must care

for our physical man to prevent annoyance to ourselves and others. You would not think of running an automobile that was not in order. How can we work if our bodies are not in good order? And when the machine gets old, we must take yet better care of it."

"Soften the squeaks, as it were," said Phil grinning, "so the rattle won't annoy the neighbors."

"Just so, Phil. The body is the temple of the Spirit. We must keep it a clean and beautiful temple; only, Mary Jane," advised Mother laughingly, "don't worship the building."

A Philosophy of Unity

He who would be an occultist must not separate either himself or anything else from the rest of creation or *non-creation.* For, the moment he distinguishes himself from even a vessel of dishonour, he will not be able to join himself to any vessel of honour. He must think of himself as an infinitesimal something, not even as an individual atom, but as a part of the world-atoms as a whole, or become an illusion, a nobody, and vanish like a breath leaving no trace behind. As illusions, we are separate distinct bodies, living in masks furnished by Maya. Can we claim one single atom in our body as distinctly our own? Everything, from spirit to the tiniest particle, is part of the whole, at best a link. Break a single link and all passes into annihilation; but this is impossible. There is a series of vehicles becoming more and more gross, from spirit to the densest matter, so that with each step downward and outward we get more and more the sense of separateness developed in us. Yet this is illusory, for if there were a real and complete separation between any two human beings, they could not communicate with, or understand each other in any way.

Thus with these hierarchies. Why should we separate their classes in our mind, except for purposes of distinction in *practical* Occultism, which is but the lowest form of applied Metaphysics. But if you seek to separate them on this plane of illusion, then all I can say is, that there exists between these Hierarchies the same abysses of distinction as between the "principles" of the Universe or those of man, if you like, and the same "principles" in a bacillus. -- H. P. B., *Transactions,* 138.

THE FALL OF IDEALS*

IN a world of illusion in which the law of evolution operates, nothing could be more natural than that the ideals of MAN—as a unit of the total, or mankind—should be for ever shifting A part of the Nature around him, that Protean, ever changing Nature, every particle of which is incessantly transformed, while the harmonious body remains as a whole ever the same, like these particles man is continually changing, physically, intellectually, morally, spiritually. At one time he is at the topmost point of the circle of development; at another, at the lowest. And, as he thus alternately rises and sinks, and his moral nature responsively expands or contracts, so will his moral code at one time embody the noblest altruistic and aspirational ideals, while at the other, the ruling conscience will be but the reflection of selfishness, brutality and faithlessness. But this, however, is so only on the external, illusionary plane. In their internal, or rather, *essential* constitution, both nature and man are at one, as their essence is identical. All grows and develops and strives toward perfection on the former planes of externality or, as well said by a philosopher is—"ever becoming;" but on the ultimate plane of the spiritual essence all IS, and remains therefore immutable. It is toward this eternal *Esse* that every thing, as every being, is gravitating, gradually, almost imperceptibly, but as surely as the Universe of stars and worlds moves towards a mysterious point known to, yet still unnamed by, astronomy and called by the Occultists—the *central Spiritual Sun.*

Hitherto, it was remarked in almost every historical age that a wide interval, almost a chasm, lay between practical and ideal perfection. Yet, as from time to time certain great characters appeared on earth who taught mankind to look beyond the veil of illusion, man learnt that the gulf was not an impassable one; that it is the province of mankind through its higher and more spiritual races to fill the great gap more and more with every coming cycle; for every man, as a unit, has it in his power to add his mite toward filling it. Yes; there are still men, who, notwithstanding the present chaotic condition of the moral world, and the sorry *débris* of the best human ideals, still persist in believing and teaching that the now *ideal* human perfection is no dream, but a law of divine nature; and

---

* This article, under the sub-title *"Theosophical Views on the Preceding,"* was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for December, 1889, following in that issue the leading article, which bore the title given above.

that, had Mankind to wait even millions of years, still it must some day reach it and rebecome *a race of gods*.

Meanwhile, the periodical rise and fall of human character on the external planes takes place now, as it did before, and the ordinary average perception of man is too weak to see that both processes occur each time on a higher plane than the preceding. But as such changes are not always the work of centuries, for often extreme changes are wrought by swift acting forces—*e. g.* by wars, speculations, epidemics, the devastation of famines or religious fanaticism—therefore, do the blind masses imagine that man ever was, is, and will be the same. To the eyes of us, moles, mankind is like our globe—seemingly stationary. And yet, both move in space and time with an equal velocity, around themselves and—*onward*.

Moreover, at whatever end of his evolution, from the birth of his consciousness, in fact, man was, and still is, the vehicle of a dual spirit in him—good and evil. Like the twin sisters of Victor Hugo's grand, posthumous poem "Satan"—the progeny issued respectively from Light and Darkness—the angel "Liberty" and the angel "Isis-Lilith" have chosen man as their dwelling on earth, and these are at eternal strife in him.

The Churches tell the world that "man is born in sin," and John (1st Epist. iii., 8) adds that "He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth from the beginning." Those who still believe in the rib-and-apple fable and in the rebellious angel "Satan," believe, as a matter of course in a personal Devil—as a contrast in a dualistic religion—to a personal God. We, Theosophists of the Eastern school, believe in neither. Yet we go, perhaps, further still than the Biblical dead letter. For we say that while as *extra-cosmic* Entities there is neither god nor devil, that both exist, nevertheless. And we add that both dwell on earth in man, being in truth, *the very man himself,* who is, as a physical being, the devil, the true vehicle of *evil,* and as a spiritual entity—god, or *good*. Hence, to say to mankind, "thou hast the devil," is to utter as metaphysical a truth as when saying to all its men, "Know ye not that god dwelleth in you?" Both statements are true. But, we are at the turning point of the great social cycle, and it is the former fact which has the upper hand at present. Yet as—to paraphrase a Pauline text—"there be devils many . . . yet there is but one Satan," so while we have a great variety of devils constituting collectively mankind, of such grandiose Satanic characters as are painted by Milton, Byron and recently by Victor Hugo, there are few, if any. Hence, owing to such mediocrity, are the human ideals falling, to remain

unreplaced; a prose-life as spiritually dead as the London November fog, and as alive with brutal materialism and vices, the seven capital sins forming but a portion of these, as that fog is with deadly microbes. Now we rarely find aspirations toward the eternal ideal in the human heart, but instead of it every thought tending toward the one central idea of our century, the great "I," *self* being for each the one mighty centre around which the whole Universe is made to revolve and turn.

When the Emperor Julian—called the *Apostate* because, believing in the grand ideals of his forefathers, the Initiates, he would not accept the human anthropomorphic form thereof—saw for the last time his beloved gods appear to him, he wept. Alas, they were no longer the bright spiritual beings he had worshipped, but only the decrepit, pale and worn out shades of the gods he had so loved. Perchance they were the prophetic vision of the departing ideals of his age, as also of our own cycle. These "gods" are now regarded by the Church as *demons* and called so; while he who has preserved a poetical, lingering love for them, is forthwith branded as an Antichrist and a modern Satan.

Well, Satan is an elastic term, and no one has yet ever given even an approximately logical definition of the symbolical meaning of the name. The first to anthropomorphize it was John Milton; he is his true putative intellectual father, as it is widely conceded that the *theological* Satan of the Fall is the "mind-born Son" of the blind poet. Bereft of his theological and dogmatic attributes Satan is simply an *adversary;*—not necessarily an "arch fiend" or a "persecutor of men," but possibly also a foe of evil. He may thus become a Saviour of the oppressed, a champion of the weak and poor, crushed by the minor devils (men), the demons of avarice, selfishness and hypocrisy. Michelet calls him the "Great Disinherited" and takes him to his heart. The giant Satan of poetical concept is, in reality, but the compound of all the dissatisfied and noble intellectuality of the age. But Victor Hugo was the first to intuitively grasp the occult truth. Satan, in his poem of that name, is a truly grandiose Entity, with enough human in him to bring it within the grasp of average intellects. To realise the Satans of Milton and of Byron is like trying to grasp a handful of the morning mist: there is nothing *human* in them. Milton's Satan wars with angels who are a sort of flying puppets, without spontaneity, pulled into the stage of being and of action by the invisible string of theological predestination; Hugo's Lucifer fights a fearful battle with his own

terrible passions and again becomes an Archangel of Light, after the awfullest agonies ever conceived by mortal mind and recorded by human pen.

All other Satanic ideals pale before his splendour. The Mephisto of Goethe is a true devil of theology; the Ahriman of Byron's "Manfred"—a too supernatural character, and even Manfred has little akin to the human element, great as was the genius of their Creator. All these images pale before Hugo's SATAN, who loves as strongly as he hates. Manfred and Cain are the incarnate *Protests* of downtrodden, wronged and persecuted individuality against the "World" and "Society"—those giant fiends and savage monsters of collective injustice. Manfred is the type of an indomitable will, proud, yielding to no influence, earthly or divine, valuing his full absolute freedom of action above any personal feeling or social consideration, higher than Nature and all in it. But, with Manfred as with Cain, the Self, the "I" is ever foremost; and there is not a spark of the all-redeeming love in them, no more than of fear. Manfred will not submit even to the universal Spirit of Evil; alone, face to face with the dark opponent of Ahura-Mazda—Universal Light—Ahriman and his countless hosts of Darkness, he still holds his own. These types arouse in one intense wonder, awe-struck amazement by their all-defiant daring, but arouse no human feeling: they are *too supernatural ideals*. Byron never thought of vivifying his Archangel with that undying spark of love which forms—nay, *must* form the essence of the "First-Born" out of the homogeneous essence of eternal Harmony and Light, and is the element of forgiving reconciliation, even in its (according to our philosophy) last terrestrial offspring—Humanity. Discord is the concomitant of differentiation, and Satan being an evolution, must in that sense, be an adversary, a contrast, being a type of Chaotic matter. The loving essence cannot be extinguished but only perverted. Without this saving redemptive power, embodied in Satan, he simply appears the nonsensical failure of omnipotent and omniscient imbecility which the opponents of theological Christianity sneeringly and very justly make him: with it he becomes a thinkable Entity, the *Asuras* of the Puranic myths, the first *breaths* of Brahma, who, after fighting the gods and defeating them are finally themselves defeated and then hurled on to the earth where they incarnate in Humanity. Thus Satanic Humanity becomes comprehensible. After moving around his cycle of obstacles he may, with accumulated experiences, after all the throes of Humanity, emerge again into the light—as Eastern philosophy teaches.

If Hugo had lived to complete his poem, possibly with strengthened insight, he would have blended his Satanic concept with that of the Aryan races which makes all minor powers, good or evil, born at the beginning and dying, at the close of each "Divine Age." As human nature is ever the same, and sociological, spiritual and intellectual evolution is a question of step by step, it is quite possible that instead of catching one half of the Satanic ideal as Hugo did, the next great poet may get it wholly: thus voicing for his generation the eternal idea of Cosmic equilibrium so nobly emphasized in the Aryan mythology. The first half of that ideal approaches sufficiently to the human ideal to make the moral tortures of Hugo's Satan entirely comprehensible to the Eastern Theosophist. What is the chief torment of this great Cosmic Anarchist? It is the moral agony caused by such a duality of nature—the tearing asunder of the Spirit of Evil and Opposition from the undying element of primeval love in the Archangel. That spark of divine love for Light and Harmony, that no HATE can wholly smother, causes him a torture far more unbearable than his Fall and exile for protest and Rebellion. This bright, heavenly spark, shining from Satan in the black darkness of his kingdom of moral night, makes him visible to the intuitive reader. It made Victor Hugo see him sobbing in superhuman despair, each mighty sob shaking the earth from pole to pole; sobs first of baffled rage that he cannot extirpate love for divine Goodness (God) from his nature; then changing into a wail of despair at being cut off from that divine love he so much yearns for. All this is intensely human. This abyss of despair is Satan's salvation. In his *Fall,* a feather drops from his white and once immaculate wing, is lighted up by a ray of divine radiance and forthwith transformed into a bright Being, the Angel LIBERTY. Thus, she is Satan's daughter, the child jointly of God and the Fallen Archangel, the progeny of Good and Evil, of Light and Darkness, and God acknowledges this common and "sublime paternity" that unites them. It is Satan's daughter who saves him. At the acme of despair at feeling himself hated by LIGHT, Satan hears the divine words "No; I hate thee not." Saith the Voice, "An angel is between us, and her deeds go to thy credit. Man, bound by thee, by her is now delivered."

"O Satan, tu peux dire à present: je vivrai!
Viens; l'Ange Liberté, c'est ta fille et la mienne
Cette paternité sublime nous unit! . . ."

The whole conception is an efflorescence of metaphysical ideality. This white lotus of thought springs now, as in former ages,

from the rottenness of the world of matter, generating *Protest* and LIBERTY. It is springing in our very midst and under our very eyes, from the mire of modern civilization, fecund bed of contrasting virtues. In this foul soil sprouted the germs which ultimately developed into All-denying protestators, Atheists, Nihilists, and Anarchists, men of the Terror. Bad, violent, criminal some of them may be, yet no one of them could stand as the copy of Satan; but taking this heart-broken, hopeless, embittered portion of humanity in their collectivity, they are just Satan himself; for he is the ideal synthesis of all discordant forces and each separate human vice or passion is but an atom of his totality. In the very depths of the heart of this HUMAN Satanic totality burns the divine spark, all negations notwithstanding. It is called LOVE FOR HUMANITY, an ardent aspiration for a universal reign of Justice—hence a latent desire for light, harmony and goodness. Where do we find such a divine spark among the proud and the wealthy? In respectable Society and the correct orthodox, so called religious portion of the public, one finds but a predominating feeling of selfishness and a desire for wealth at the expense of the weak and the destitute, hence as a parallel, indifference to injustice and evil. Before Satan, the incarnate PROTEST, repents and reunites with his fellow men in one common Brotherhood, all cause for protest must have disappeared from earth. And that can come to pass only when Greed, Bias, and Prejudice shall have disappeared before the elements of Altruism and Justice to all. Freedom, or Liberty, is but a vain word just now all over the civilized globe; freedom is but a cunning synonym for oppression of the people in the name of the people, and it exists for castes, never for units. To bring about the reign of Freedom as contemplated by Hugo's Satan, the "Angel Liberty" has to be born simultaneously and by common love and consent of the "higher" wealthy caste, and the "lower" classes—the poor; in other words, to become the progeny of "God" and "Satan," thereby reconciling the two.

But this is a Utopia—for the present. It cannot take place before the castes of the modern *Levites* and their theology—the Dead-sea fruit of Spirituality—shall have disappeared; and the priests of the Future have declared before the whole World in the words of *their* "God"—

> "Et j' éfface la nuit sinistre, et rien n'en reste,
> Satan est mort, renais O LUCIFER CELESTE!"

H. P. B.

THE EYE OF SPIRIT VERSUS THE EYE OF MATTER

THEOSOPHY presents to the world not merely a body of knowledge very different from the knowledge possessed by the most learned scholars and scientists of our universities, but it postulates in addition a method for the acquisition of that knowledge which is in marked contrast to the method employed by science. The importance of method consists in the fact that there may be a relationship between knowledge and the method for its attainment. Let us first inquire into the objectives at which both occult and profane science seek to arrive. In a sense, these objectives are the same. Do not science and speculative philosophy also seek a unitary basis of knowledge and of life? Do they not also seek uniform and universal laws in a universe of infinite variety and apparent confusion? Whence this urge to seek solutions to these self-posited problems? This urge, Theosophy teaches, has its origin in what it terms "inherent ideas." The occult scientist postulates three fundamental propositions well known to all Theosophic students, and the truth of these propositions the Secret Doctrine regards "as evident as the sun in heaven." To the materialistic scientist they are not so evident and he racks his brains seeking to prove the truth of that which the occultist regards as axiomatic. In this fact lies an important difference in the methods of Theosophy and of science. The occultist is engaged in investigating the applications and the ramifications of his three fundamentals "in the bewildering series of evolutionary progress" and in every department of nature. The scientist and speculative philosopher, ignorant or unconvinced of the inherent reasonableness of the basic conceptions of the Secret Doctrine, enters upon his investigations and speculations with a confused understanding. He is torn between the light of *Buddhi* cast upon his intellect in spite of himself, and the determination of his lower mind to deny that light, unless it can establish its justification, by external proof. He soon finds himself wrapt in a bewildering maze of particulars and the end of his labors finds him in a state of "confusion worse confounded"; for no amount of purely external investigation can reveal the hidden heart of life.

It is commonly stated that modern science employs the inductive method in the pursuit of its knowledge, and that it proceeds from

particulars to universals; whereas occult science employs the very reverse, or deductive, method, proceeding from universals to particulars. The nomenclature here used is rather that of science than of occultism and because of this it is necessary to examine this statement closely and to define clearly the terms employed. The universal of science is merely a particular of a larger scope. Science is engaged on the objective, external and phenomenal plane; its work consists almost exclusively in the classification of phenomena, and the universal arrived at is only the designation of a particular group of phenomenal observations. Science is engaged in extending and investigating merely the surface area of knowledge and no amount of such explorations can ever reveal the content of that which lies beneath the surface, any more than an exploration of the surface of the earth can throw much light upon the treasures hidden within. In fact, as soon as a profane scientist or a speculative philosopher begins to explore beneath the surface he approaches the adytum and sacred precinct of the occultist.

An example of such a philosopher was Leibnitz. It was Leibnitz who destroyed the contrast of animate and inanimate matter by showing that the atom as an external and material thing was untenable. If there is no limit to the divisibility of matter into atoms, then this argument carried to its logical conclusion reduces the atoms to mathematical points. They are now no longer physical but metaphysical entities and must be sought for and investigated in the depths of inner, abstract space rather than in the length and breadth of outer, concrete space. In place of the material atoms, Leibnitz saw an infinity of metaphysical and immaterial atoms, which he denominated monads. Every monad was a living mirror of the universe and a God, and monads were everywhere. Leibnitz' concept of the monads may be regarded as the occult conception of universals. In the occult sciences, the minutest particle at every point of space is a basic unit holding in potentiality and in latency the infinite possibilities of all life. In principle and in essence a molecule and a man are equal, the difference between them being merely in the extent to which that which was latent is now patent. Theosophy teaches that not only is a man a microcosom or little universe, but that every atom at every point of space is likewise a potential microcosom, a universal, if we care to use that term. The whole is in every part and every part is in the whole. The occultist admits of no particulars in the sense that science uses that term. There are only universals in various stages and degrees of evolution and unfoldment.

The basic difference in the points of view of science and Theosophy lies in the fact that science endeavors to prove with the eye of matter that which can only be perceived with the eye of spirit. It is ever the inner man who is the eternal witness, the Great Sifter, the changeless center. It is the center that establishes the relationship and determines the value of all peripheral objects. The shifting, the changeable, the evanescent, the illusive; these can never throw any light upon the Real and the Eternal; and yet this is the tantalizing task that science sets before itself. The mystery of life keeps ever receding for those who would approach it via its endless and labyrinthian emanations. Life can never be known from the outside.

The materialistic scientist sees no connection between ethics and knowledge. He is puzzled when informed that the acquisition of real wisdom is dependent on altruism and brotherhood. Yet it is a fundamental teaching of the Wisdom-Religion that metaphysical and spiritual truths cannot be known or understood without a certain ethical attitude towards life. That in ethics should be found a method for the acquisition of knowledge is a point that science will not concede and actually scorns. This attitude is the result of, and goes hand in hand with, the conviction that by looking outward upon the world of matter, are to be found solutions to the baffling riddles that confront man at every turn. The concept of brotherhood rests on the concepts of a unitary basis of all life, of the operation of law in every department of visible and invisible nature, and of the progressive evolution of all beings on equal terms. Since these universal ideas can never be attained through the investigation of particulars in the phenomenal world, science is ignorant of the spiritual unity of all life, is baffled by the apparent breakdown of law in the cosmos, and divides nature into unrelated elements, forces and beings. Seeing nought but separateness and struggle, its loftiest ideal of altruism never rises above enlightened selfishness; and for it, brotherhood, selflessness and sacrifice are anomalies that find nowhere their justification in nature. It is only when man realizes that universal compassion is the law and the essence of spiritual life, that nature yields up her mysteries and that which before was dark becomes as bright as the noonday sun. Only in the first object of the Theosophical Movement is to be found the key to the method for the acquisition of occult knowledge.

OUR DIVINE ANCESTORS

Some Statements of H. P. B.

THE SECRET DOCTRINE teaches *history*— which, for being Esoteric and traditional, is none the less more reliable than profane history. And that Doctrine says that the Dhyani-Buddhas furnished the many and various races with divine kings and leaders, who taught humanity their arts and sciences, and revealed to the incarnated Monads the great spiritual truths of the transcendental worlds.

It is with the advent of the divine Dynasties that the first civiliztions were started. And while, in some regions of the Earth, a portion of mankind preferred leading a nomadic and patriarchal life, and in others savage man was hardly learning to build a fire, his brothers—more favoured than he by their *Karma,* and helped by the divine intelligence which informed them—built cities, and cultivated arts and sciences. Civilization has ever developed the physical and the intellectual at the cost of the psychic and spiritual. Gradually, mankind went down in stature, for, even before the real advent of the Fourth or Atlantean race, the majority of mankind had fallen into iniquity and sin, save the hierarchy of the "Elect." Then came the Atlanteans; the giants whose physical beauty and strength reached their climax toward the middle period of their fourth subrace. It is to this period that we have to look for the first appearance of the Ancestors of those, who are termed by us the most ancient peoples of the world—now called respectively the Aryan Hindus, the Egyptians, and the oldest Persians, on the one hand, and the Chaldees and Phoenicians on the other. These were governed by the DIVINE DYNASTIES, *i.e.,* kings and rulers who had of mortal man only his physical appearance *as it was then,* but who were Beings from spheres higher and more celestial than our own sphere will be, long Manvantaras hence.

The Titans-Kabirim were the generators and regulators of the seasons, the gods presiding over all the metals and terrestrial works; in their original divine characters, the beneficent Entities who brought light to the world, and endowed humanity with intellect and reason. They are truly "the great, beneficent and powerful Gods," also in the beginning of times, the rulers of mankind. When incarnated as Kings of the "divine Dynasties," they gave the first impulse to civilizations, and directed the mind with which they had endued men to the invention and perfection of all the arts and sciences.

There have been several Divine Dynasties—a series for every Root Race beginning with the Third, each series according and adapted to its Humanity. The last Seven Dynasties referred to in the Egyptian and Chaldean records belong to the Fifth Race. The Egyptians and the Chaldeans referred the birth of their *divine Dynasties* to that period when creative Earth was in her last final throes, in giving birth to her prehistoric mountain ranges, her seas and her continents.

Our races have sprung from divine races, by whatever name they are called. One and all have been derived from the primitive Dhyan-Chohans of the Esoteric doctrine. From Manu down to Plato, all tell us of seven *divine* Dynasties; of the seven primitive and dual gods who descend from their celestial abode and reign on Earth, teaching mankind Astronomy, Architecture, and all the other sciences that have come down to us. These Beings appear first as "gods" and Creators; then they merge in nascent man, to finally emerge as "divine-Kings and Rulers."

FROM A STUDENT'S NOTE-BOOK

What is the Teaching for, if not as a basis for human conduct? Hence the need of a Theosophical Education if one would live the life, and thus *know* the doctrine. Book study provides a map or chart; then the student must *travel* if observation and experience are to place him understandingly in the ranks of the true Theosophists. So often one finds himself at a loss as to right action under any given circumstance. It is as if a surveyor found himself puzzled in the field because he had forgotten his mathematics. The *teachings* will provide anyone with practical direction at all times and in all relations, if known, trusted and made operative. Held as a matter of *belief*, this demonstrable fact is not effective—hence the fallibility of "book knowledge" and "profession" under stress and strain. Application alone turns theory into fact, or demonstrates its fallacy. Those who know their books and prove them by life—they are the students who respect Theosophy, for they are beginning to *know* it.

THE ONE DESIRE

ALL types of men in all times and in the most widely diverse conditions have been possessed of one common desire—the desire to find the Reality anteceding all manifestation, and to establish their "relation" with that Reality. It would seem that so exalted a propellant might have constituted a strong and fraternal bond between widely separated branches of the human family—a bond capable of cementing all men in universal brotherhood such as the human race has never yet achieved in actuality.

So intense has been man's desire to find Reality for his own upliftment that the very ardor of his selfish purpose has built barriers of bigotry and hate that have resulted in pages of history drenched with the blood of those who also had the one desire, but found that its force led them to search in devious ways which were not the ways of their persecutors.

If we turn to primitive man, we find him in the heart of the forest perhaps laying one stone upon another in an attempt to build an altar to his conception of the One Reality. It may be that he conceived his god as manifesting through the sun or through the great oaks of the forest. However inadequate his conception, his desire is one with the desire of all other men. He is reaching to the limit of his capacity, and the pile of stones is the tangible manifestation of his dominant desire.

We find civilized man building cathedrals and churches, mosques and synagogues to the glory of a personal god or a tribal deity. His method differs from that of his brother but his desire is identical. It is to find Reality and "relate" himself thereto.

Turning to spiritual man, we find him fixing his attention, not upon some distant manifestation of nature, not upon an anthropomorphic god made in the image of man, but turning his attention inward. He searches the divine possibilities of his own nature. He recognizes no temple save the body of man. His altar he builds from lofty thoughts and kindly deeds, and he places it within the recesses of his own being.

It has been truly said that man has never been without a friend. If men of modern times will turn in their search for Reality to the most recent expression of the most ancient truth, the "Secret Doctrine" of H. P. Blavatsky, they will find there established three fundamental propositions, faithful study and clear understanding of which may lead to the realization of the desire so long unsatisfied;

these propositions indicate the law and the life by which *not* relation, but identity, may be established with Reality.

These ancient axioms deal with one Absolute Reality which antecedes all manifested conditions, being an Impersonal Principle which transcends the power of human conception. If man thinks of the most remote point in space, it is there and yet it is always most near, being in and about him wherever he may be. It is to be found in the tiniest underground root, and in the most distant star, as in all that is, between, beneath, and beyond. Truly there is no place nor thing where it is not, though because of the dullness of the vehicle it does not always shine forth. It is here today as it was in all the yesterdays and as it will be tomorrow—a Principle Boundless, and Eternal. In a world of change it remains changeless. It is the Causeless Cause and the Rootless Root, beyond all thought or speculation.

Man cannot associate Infinite Reality with the wrath or love of God, nor can he relate it in thought to any attribute whatever. It is that man may grow out of personality into Reality that the old and narrow path exists. The way from the limited and circumscribed to the Infinite and Boundless is the way of evolution and the object of human existence.

Once man passes in thought from the One Reality, duality supervenes in the contrast of spirit and matter. If in his ignorance man attempts to separate spirit and matter, he becomes befogged in a maze of confusion, for form exists because of spirit, and spirit, in order to manifest, needs a vehicle of expression. And both are aspects of Reality. He who conceives of the many apart from the One wanders away from his goal and prepares for himself a weary road back, for one day he must return to a knowledge of the Unity from which he came forth.

The Secret Doctrine further asserts the absolute universality of the law of periodicity. Man may relate the law to himself and to all else in the universe and thereby lighten his darkness to the extent of his powers of true deduction. In all departments of nature he may observe the ceaseless operation of the law of cause and effect and effect again becoming cause. Life is a great school in which man may vastly learn from his observations of the working of the law. If he does not learn, how can be apply; and without application, where does man find himself on the journey?

The Secret Doctrine establishes as a third proposition, the fundamental identity of all Souls with the Universal Over-soul, and the obligatory pilgrimage of every Soul through the Cycle of Incarna-

tion in accordance with Cyclic and Karmic law during the whole term.

Man moves ever onward in accordance with the law. Though if he is unobservant his progress may be slow. The very fact that he has reached the stage of independent conscious existence proves the vast distance he has traveled since the spark which issued from the pure essence of the Over-soul must of necessity have passed through every elemental form of the phenomenal world before the man stage was reached. The brain reels at the vastness of his past experience and the duration of his journey, and yet man, the Eternal Pilgrim and the Immortal Spirit, is still piling stone upon stone, still rearing spires and altars in his search for the One Reality. And so will he continue to beat against the bars of his own making and struggle madly in the darkness, though light is at hand.

The human cry out of darkness and ignorance rings in wailing cadence down the ages, "Lighten Thou our darkness, O Lord." In this cry is indicated man's chief difficulty, for by self effort alone is light brought out of darkness; there are no favors along the way.

When man recognizes himself as *one with* Reality and by sustained effort is able to make that Reality a living power in daily life; when the law becomes his refuge and his guide in thought and deed; when life shall be seen in all its glory as the journey of Consciousness to know itself as one with all that is, then is man no longer struggling in fog and darkness, for he himself is the living embodiment of the three ancient axioms of the Secret Doctrine. He has become the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Then only does the One Desire bear its fruit.

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Second Object in Practice

In the *Literary Digest* for April 13, 1929, we learn the details of what is perhaps one of the bitterest blows orthodoxy and Christian self-satisfaction has received for many decades. Prof. Samuel Lucas Joshi is a Christian Hindu holding the Chair of Comparative Religion at Dartmouth College, his parents being Brahmin converts to Christianity. Prof. Joshi has accumulated a great number of opinions on the religious question from his students. Before daring to express them, the *Literary Digest* cautiously washes its hands of the matter thus:

> Perhaps it should be noted here that such an attitude may alarm some of the religious leaders and cause dismay among the conservatives to whom all religion is summed up in a creed and faith defined in dogma, and they may object to giving space to these outpourings of youthful minds as being calculated to spread disbelief, or at least raise a doubt among the immature that the truth has been once for all delivered. But error, if error there be, can not be combated until it is uncovered, and it is necessary for the Church to learn what is going on in their minds if it would know how to deal with the younger generation.

Student Opinions

Some of the opinions follow:

> If I were to set down in one sentence my conception of God, the universe and religion in general, it would be in accordance with the more or less pantheistic view; namely, the identification of God with the universe and the laws of nature. That God would be an impartial creator impervious to prayer and sacrifice and unapproachable by bribes of any sort. In short, man's salvation would lie solely within himself and would not be the special dispensation of any God or hierarchy of gods. Sin would be entirely mental, and not a part of man as in Christianity, for the only sin would be the misuse of the laws of nature by which the universe is governed, the result of which would be pain and and the deprivation of happiness. Thus seen, God would be in no sense an anthropomorphic Being. . . .
>
> "God" is merely a vague term for the unchanging laws of nature, and he who by prayers and sacrifices expects to interfere with these laws is surely on the highway to insanity. Perfection can be reached only by man working along with his fellows intelligently. . . .
>
> The incentive of compensatory rewards and retributive pun-

ishments in this life or the next is necessary to the moral development of the individual, but the idea of doing a noble act without any attachment to the fruit of action as taught by the Stoics and the Bhagvad Gita in India is nobler. . . .

Karma "Sensible"

The Buddhist view that every man must exercise aright his free will and become the master of his own fate under the law of Karma is to me the most sensible idea of salvation ever known. . . .

I believe if we all believed in the sensible law of Karma the world would seem a better place to live in. . . .

None of the Semitic religions has ever appealed to me. They have no satisfactory metaphysical background so essential to the rational understanding of religion. Buddha never wasted time and energy in speculating on the nature of God, but in a preeminently practical way organized a religious movement which seems to appeal both to the scientist and the philosopher. The Christian view that you must secure your salvation by placing your faith in the merits of the crucifixion is suggestive of mental indolence and lacks the dynamic moral energy of Buddhism, which tells every man to work out his own salvation. As we are unconsciously encouraging lawbreaking and hypocrisy through half-baked attempts to enforce Prohibition, so the ministers of churches are often forced to be preaching doctrines in which they have ceased to believe and encouraging hypocrisy. I follow Christ in regarding hypocrisy as the greatest sin. . . .

Other Views

These of course are almost purely Theosophical, even in name. On the dark side of the question is one student who thinks that all religions are based on certain hypothetical postulates, and that one is as good as another, provided it produces "good conduct." Another who thinks that the "soul is an emotion created by the secretion of our ductless glands" (an idea abandoned twenty-five years ago by all intelligent minds), and the shapeless in-between ideas such as the following, which have a reasonably fair seeming, but put in practice are often sawdust and ashes:

If an inordinate desire to acquire wealth dominates our life, we become less capable to love our neighbors as ourselves. The ethics of individual self-realization appeal to me as a better type of religion than mechanical prayers in congregational worship. Truly religious men must learn to depend more on the authority of experience and reason than the authority of the Church or the Scriptures.

LAYA CENTERS?

Sir J. H. Jeans, the famous British astronomer, has been bold enough to produce a speculation which actually reaches out of the material world for an explanation of matter, into the only region where such will ever be found—the metaphysical. (*Manchester Guardian Weekly,* Aug. 3, 1928).

He suggests that the explanation of the spiral arms of the nebulae may be that their arms are "taps" *through which matter pours into our universe.*

Is this true? In a sense it seems that it may be, when one sets together the various statements about stellar origins which are to be found in the *Secret Doctrine.*

> The spectra of the resolvable and irresolvable nebulae are shown to be entirely different, the spectra of the latter showing their physical state to be that of glowing gas or vapour. The bright lines of one nebula reveal the existence of hydrogen in it, and of other material substances known and unknown. The same in the atmosphere of the Sun and stars. This leads to the direct inference that a star is formed by the condensation of a nebula; hence that even the metals themselves on earth are formed owing to the condensation of hydrogen or some other primitive matter, some ancestral cousin to "helium," perhaps, or some yet unknown stuff? *This does not clash with the occult teachings.* And this is the problem that chemistry is trying to solve; and it must succeed sooner or later in the task, accepting *nolens volens,* when it does, the esoteric teaching. But when this does happen, it will kill the nebular theory as it now stands. (*Secret Doctrine,* Vol. I, p. 595-6).
>
> Space is the real world, while our world is an artificial one. It is the One Unity throughout its infinitude: in its bottomless depths as on its illusive surface; a surface studded with countless phenomenal Universes, systems and mirage-like worlds. Nevertheless, to the Eastern Occultist, who is an objective Idealist at the bottom, in the *real* world, which is a Unity of Forces, there is "a connection of all matter in the *plenum,*" as Leibnitz would say. (*S. D.* I, 615).
>
> ". . . *we might . . . see* . . . the entire universe concentrating itself, as it were, in a single point." And that "point," *invisible on our plane of perception and matter,* is quite visible to the eye of the adept who can follow and see it present on other planes. (*S. D.* I, 489).

THE "PRIMORDIAL POINT"

A laya center is a permanent point in space—in its geometrical and astronomical aspect—existing from age to age through the

creation and dissolution of worlds, as the foundation of bodies ever-renewed—one of the "black embrasures of the Absolute, from which shines the light of eternity," to render H. P. B.'s words roughly. Who knows but that at the return of a system from Nirvana, rebirth after a great Pralya, primordial matter *does* pour out seemingly from a point—pour out from inner spaces unknowable and unguessable.

Not to forget, however, that "laya center" means more than a geometrical point; it includes the basic germs of manifestation co-existing on seven planes, but not localizable as separate in the space known to man. Hence, "seven laya centers dug through space."

The Unknown Planet

According to *Science,* Dec. 21, 1928, Prof. W. H. Pickering has announced the existence of a hitherto undiscovered planet, never yet seen, but found by its perturbatory effects on other bodies; it has received the temporary name of "Planet O." This planet has another name, and has had it for ages unguessed by the present generation.

> . . . we merely state that only seven of our planets are as intimately related to our globe, as the Sun is to all the bodies subject to him in his system. Of these bodies the poor little number of *primary* and *secondary* planets known to astronomy, looks wretched enough, in truth. Therefore, it stands to reason that there are a great number of planets, small and large, that have not been discovered yet, but of the existence of which ancient astronomers—all of them initiated adepts—must have certainly been aware. (*S. D.* I, 575-6).

Why invisible? Without dogmatising too much, pending further light, very likely this is one of those planets existing at that stage of evolution where they are not in consubstantiality with earth, and so are invisible to human eyes; and that some such planets may nevertheless be on planes of semi-materiality or magnetic substantiality where they have a visible physical *effect.* Such is the case with the astral body of man under certain conditions; and every planet in its evolutionary course passes through transformations carrying it from the highest ethereality to stages material even beyond our understanding, and back again.

A Sinister Tide

Recently the *Daily News and Westminster* (London) undertook a poll on the question of communication with the dead. The results were as follows:

Those who believed the thesis definitely proven 7,502
Those who believed it definitely disproven.....2,766
Those who believed it might be possible, but did not regard it proven as yet 1,987

Total 12,255

"RETURN OF IMPRESSION"

Since the beginning of this century, with the exception of a brief flare of interest generated by the abnormal conditions prevailing during and just after the War, spiritualism has been virtually dormant. Discounting the probability that the positive side in the above poll would tend to be favored by the fact that the "faithful" would be more certain to reply than others, it nevertheless remains clear that spiritualism has quietly mounted once more to an imposing place.

It is a concomitant and an inevitable accompaniment of the centenary Theosophical cycle. Modern spiritualism, as most think, took its rise with the Fox sisters in the forties of last century. However, it had existed prior to that in many forms—but the time for public furore was not yet ripe. The end of the first quarter of every century is December 21st in the Theosophic year; and the great psychic tides in human nature begin to swell once more; the stir of spiritual power reawakening far, far down in the hidden deeps of the race soul, stirs the psychic nature into action for good or for ill long before it becomes outwardly visible. That tide rises steadily though unnoted, manifesting itself chiefly in a mounting psychic fever, until the vast dangers entrained thereby *force* action in the last quarter by Those Who Know; force action, and also furnish that action with a fulcrum in the form of public interest in the unseen. Theosophy is the antidote to spiritualism, because Theosophy explains it *sanely*.

HUMAN CYCLES—TROPICAL AND ARCTIC

Messrs. Touraief and Struve, two Russian Egyptologists, discover in translating the papyrus of Golentis, that the solution of the circle and sphere dates back 3,700 years. Abbé Moreux thereupon remarks that the Egyptians "had a complete knowledge of the figure and dimensions of the earth." "I do not explain the fact; I only state it." Would that we had more of that true scientific humility which does not consider it necessary to be able to explain a fact

before accepting its existence! (See Press of Feb. 19, 1928, and *Science,* Dec. 14, 1928).

Greeks "Parvenus"

It is to be noted that we may now hope to have an end of the delusion that the Greeks—actually parvenus in the true culture of the race—originated all real knowledge. For it is a delusion principally due to an instinctive recognition in the modern mind that the mental processes of the Greeks were akin to our own, not alien like the more spiritual ratiocination of India and Egypt; due also to our worship of Aristotle, who was the first, through lack of comprehension, to materialize the doctrines of his Master, Plato, and from that starting point to set science on the path of induction and materialisic conception which it has for the most part followed ever since.

In *Science,* Oct. 26, 1928, we find an evidence of the rule of the Great Second Fundamental Principle of Theosophy—the law of Cycles—as related to human affairs, in regions where one does not particularly expect its traces—Alaska. Henry J. Collins, of the Smithsonian Institution, located evidence of a past period when the people attained a high point of culture and then dropped back.

Whether Egyptian, Indian, or Alaskan, the same law rules everywhere; cycles of darkness must follow cycles of light, cycles of degradation, cycles of nobility, through the ages. A stream of egos creates for itself, little by little, a new type of physical expression in a new environment; runs its appointed course, gains what it can, and then—minus that proportion of its units who have fallen in the eternal struggle between spirit and matter—trickles into a new place once more; a trickle which at the inauguration of certain cycles, like the contemporary birth of the new American Race, swells into a mighty stream.

Falling Races

The old bodies, the animating force drawn off to other spheres, degenerate piecemeal and become the receptacles of lesser beings. The blood of the Pharoahs runs in the veins of the dirty Fellaheen; that of the mighty men of Atlantis in those of the poor American Indians of today. And the day will come when a new race will trample underfoot the flabby "aborigines" who in long distant ages will be our own fleshly posterity. Where shall we be? In the terrestrial hell or heaven we shall have made for ourselves.

A LONELY "ACCIDENT"

One recalls how scientific men for years have laughed at th poverty-stricken anthropocentrism of the church Fathers, who re garded Earth as God's only man-bearing planet, and to suppor the egoistic conception, upon occasion burned those, who, like Bruno, maintained the plurality of inhabited worlds. Yet their Karma has curiously struck home in a theory identical but without the pleasing support to human vanity afforded by the ecclesiastic ideas.

Man is once more thought to be alone in the universe, and the earth considered the only life-supporting planet, chosen not by "act of God" but by "fortuitous concatenation of atoms"—*via* the Moulton-Chamberlain "planetesimal hypothesis."

This hypothesis is to the effect that the planets of the solar system were formed by the passage of a star which tore matter out of the sun and scattered it to become planets by successive aggregations. If such were really the manner in which planets were formed, the anthropocentric idea would be logical in the extreme; as Prof. Jeans says (*Astronomy and Cosmogony*), though there are many stars in the sky, "in but rare cases can material have been torn from them in process of evolution to have formed separate accompanying planets. One star in 100,000 may have formed a planetary system in the whole course of its existence, and of such, instances must be rare where present conditions favor life."

A PARADOX

One of the most astonishing things in nature is the manner in which the scientific mind presents with one hand the wholly correct doctrine of rigid law, cause and effect; and with the other a picture of highly important issues dependent entirely upon the flimsy thread of chance. Even though the idea were statistically true, yet even the presence of such rare systems involves the existence of millions upon millions of sentient beings, a congeries of hopes, despairs, loves, hates, joys, and sorrows, cosmic in depth if not extent; all of which must literally and absolutely have been created *ex nihilo* unless emerged from pre-existing sentient life.

The whole fallacy lies in the narrow idea of "life" as meaning a certain category of quasi-mechanical and chemical actions; whereas life means consciousness and consciousness is inherent in all matter—unless one is indeed to accept creation from nothing to the fullest extent. In full truth consciousness not only exists every-

where but builds its instruments according to the materials at hand; the mere chemical machinery necessary to physical "life" can and does exist in forms accommodated to melted iron temperatures as well as to the cold of interstellar space, ranging from the inconceivably great to the infinitely small. Let science once divorce itself from a concept of "life" as rigid as it is childish, and the inevitable corollary must be seen.

Life Everywhere

The Occult cosmogony, as outlined in the *Secret Doctrine,* does not state what proportion of contemporary stars rule man-bearing planets; nevertheless space is full of living beings; living, even according to the "scientific" definition of life.

> *"Every world has its parent star and sister planet. Thus Earth is the adopted child and younger brother of Venus, but its inhabitants are of their own kind. . . . All sentient complete beings* (full septenary men or higher beings) *are furnished, in their beginnings, with forms and organisms in full harmony with the nature and state of the sphere they inhabit.*
>
> *The Spheres of Being, or centres of life, which are isolated nuclei breeding their men and their animals, are numberless; not one has any resemblance to its sister-companion or to any other in its own special progeny."* (*S. D.* II, 33).
>
> How, then, . . . can *we* hope to speculate with profit on the nature of globes which, in the economy of nature, must needs belong to states of consciousness other and quite different from *any* which man experiences here?
>
> . . . Still the fact remains that most of the planets, as the stars beyond our system, are inhabited. (*S. D.* II, 701).

Another Fallacy

> Another of the fallacies from the Occult stand-point, which are embodied in the modern theory as it now stands, is the hypothesis that the planets were all detached from the Sun; that they are bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh; whereas, the Sun and planets are only co-uterine brothers, having had the same nebular origin, only in a different mode from that postulated by modern astronomy. (*S. D.* I, 588-9).

Meantime, with H. P. B., let us

> . . . rest content with the three conclusions which M. C. Flammarion . . . formulates as rigorous and exact deductions from the known *facts* and laws of science:
>
> I. The various forces which were active in the beginning of evolution gave birth to a great variety of beings on the several worlds; both in the organic and inorganic kingdoms.

II. The animated beings were constituted from the first according to forms and organisms in correlation with the physiological state of each inhabited globe.

III. The humanities of other worlds differ from us, as much in their inner organization as in their external physical type. (*S. D.* II, 707).

MAYA'S VEILS

A most curious circumstance is reported in *The Week's Scienc* for Sept. 17, 1928.

In studying the numbers and configuration of sunspots during a recent period, comparison of notes between Prof. Alfred Wolfer of Zurich, and Prof. Iseei Yamamoto, of Kyoto University, Japan showed a radical discrepancy of perception, which was never re solved between those named. In 1926 Prof. Wolfer retired—whereafter his successor, Prof. W. Brunner, checked Prof. Yama moto's observations perfectly.

One recalls that during the first years that the Martian "canals" were observed, there was violent dispute over their actual exist ence; in fact, long after definite diagrams of them had been drawn and checked by Prof. Lowell and others, their colleagues denied their very existence, setting it all down to optical illusion or eye fatigue. Nor was there any such physiological difference in the visual capacities of those concerned as would be required to explain the discrepancy on those grounds alone.

Now in fact, the whole of our objective perception is, from a fundamental point of view, illusion, and cannot be otherwise upon the showing of physiology itself. What we see, feel, and touch is not "things," but received impressions. Those impressions come through apparatus of various kinds, and their nature and accuracy depend utterly upon the apparatus. For a race to live under delu sion unadulterated, needs but that its instruments of perception be constructed and graduated alike in their faults. The recent devel opments of scientific research themselves show that what we think we see cannot possibly be what we really see; so why wonder at discrepancies in perception? But how sure—oh, how very sure—are we of the solidity, reality, and permanence of the visual, tan gible and audible experiences of life, and how quick to relegate to the realms of folly and fanaticism those great beings who from age to age have pierced the thin veils between the real and the unreal and have shown to a miserable humanity the cause of its woes and fallacious perceptions of the Real!